

Baryogenesis in a flat direction with neither baryon nor lepton charge

Takeshi Chiba

Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

Fuminobu Takahashi

Research Center for the Early Universe, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

Masahide Yamaguchi

Physics Department, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

We present a new mechanism of spontaneous baryogenesis. Usually such mechanisms require a derivative coupling between a scalar field and baryon current. In our model, the scalar field instead derivatively couples to a current associated with some global symmetry $U(1)_Q$. In this case, baryogenesis is still possible provided that an interaction exists, which violates the baryon and $U(1)_Q$ symmetries simultaneously. As a concrete example, we discuss baryogenesis in a flat direction with neither baryon nor lepton charge.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq

KUNS-1834, RESCEU-47/03, BROWN-HET-1351

Baryogenesis is one of the most important challenges in cosmology and particle physics. Sakharov proposed three conditions to realize baryogenesis [1]: (i) an interaction which actually violates baryon conservation, (ii) violation of C and CP symmetries, (iii) deviation from thermal equilibrium. Thus far, many scenarios which have been proposed, satisfy the above requirements. However, a spontaneous baryogenesis mechanism, which was proposed by Cohen and Kaplan, works even in thermal equilibrium [2] contrary to the above conditions. This is because, while Sakharov's conditions apply for the case where CPT symmetry is conserved, CPT symmetry is violated in the context of any spontaneous baryogenesis mechanism. Some applications of spontaneous baryogenesis have recently been discussed in [3, 4, 5, 6].

A spontaneous baryogenesis mechanism requires a derivative coupling between a scalar field a and a baryon current J_B^μ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = -\frac{\partial_\mu a}{f} J_B^\mu, \quad (1)$$

where f is a cut-off scale. The baryon current J_B^μ is given by

$$J_B^\mu = \sum_i B_i j_i^\mu, \quad (2)$$

where B_i and j_i^μ are, respectively, the baryon number and the usual number current of the i -th field. A nonzero value of $\partial_\mu a$ leads to spontaneous CPT violation since $\partial_\mu a$ is odd under CPT transformations. This enables spontaneous baryogenesis mechanisms to evade Sakharov's conditions. Assuming that a is homogeneous,

the derivative interaction becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = -\frac{\dot{a}}{f} n_B \equiv \sum_i \mu_i n_i, \quad (3)$$

where the dot denotes differentiation with respect to time, n_B is the baryon number density, and n_i is the number density of the i -th field. $\mu_i \equiv -\dot{a} B_i / f$ is an effective chemical potential for the i -th field, which creates a bias between baryons and anti-baryons. Then, according to the effective chemical potential, the baryon number density is induced while in thermal equilibrium,

$$n_B(t) = \sum_i B_i \frac{g_i \kappa_i T^3}{6} \left(\frac{\mu_i}{T} + O \left[\left(\frac{\mu_i}{T} \right)^3 \right] \right), \quad (4)$$

where g_i represents the degree of freedom of the corresponding fields, κ_i is 1 for fermions and 2 for bosons, and the summation should be taken for light fields in thermal equilibrium. In fact, baryon asymmetry is generated only when a baryon number violating interaction actually exists and is in thermal equilibrium. Thus, the final baryon asymmetry is determined at decoupling of the baryon number violating interaction.

In the above example, a scalar field derivatively couples to the baryon current. However, in this Letter, we show that baryogenesis is still possible even if a scalar field derivatively couples not to baryon current, but to other currents such as the lepton current and/or the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) current. Our basic idea is very simple. Assume that a scalar field derivatively couples to some global $U(1)_Q$ current which is not necessarily related to baryon current. Then, if an interaction exists and is in thermal equilibrium, which violates $U(1)_Q$ and

baryon symmetries simultaneously, baryon asymmetry is generated in addition to the $U(1)_Q$ asymmetry through the spontaneous mechanism. This is because the ratio of $U(1)_Q$ charge to baryon charge must follow the ratio of violations of the interaction. Therefore generation of $U(1)_Q$ asymmetry always involves generation of baryon asymmetry.

The above idea has a lot of implications. For example, if a scalar field derivatively couples to lepton current and an interaction violating both lepton and baryon symmetries is in thermal equilibrium, baryon asymmetry is generated without resort to sphaleron effects. More amazingly, even if a scalar field has an interaction with neither baryon nor lepton charge but only derivatively couples to some global $U(1)_Q$ current such as PQ current, baryon asymmetry is generated provided that an interaction which violates both $U(1)_Q$ and baryon symmetries is in thermal equilibrium.¹

To make our ideas clear and concrete, we consider spontaneous baryogenesis in the context of flat directions with neither baryon nor lepton charge. The characteristics of flat directions enable spontaneous baryogenesis to be realized. First of all, due to its flatness, a flat direction can easily acquire a large vacuum expectation value, which yields a derivative interaction between its phase and the symmetry current under which the flat direction is charged. Second, by virtue of a charge violating term (a so-called A-term), the phase starts rotating, thus acquiring a nonzero velocity. Thus, flat directions are suitable for realizing spontaneous baryogenesis. Use in baryogenesis of these features of flat directions was first proposed by Affleck and Dine in a slightly different context [7]. If a flat direction has baryon and/or lepton number, rotation of its phase due to an A-term generates baryon and/or lepton asymmetries as a condensate of the flat direction. After decay of the flat direction, such asymmetries are transferred to the ordinary quarks and leptons completing baryo/leptogenesis. However, this mechanism applies only to flat directions with non-zero $B - L$ charge because otherwise sphaleron effects wash out the produced baryon asymmetry. Recently, it was pointed out that this mechanism can be applied to flat directions with vanishing $B - L$ charge by virtue of Q -balls [8, 9, 10]. This is because Q -balls can protect the $B + L$ asymmetry from the sphaleron effects. However, the mechanism does not work for flat directions with neither baryon nor lepton charge because no condensation of baryon or lepton number is produced. In this Letter, we show that baryogenesis is still possible for such a flat direction by

applying the spontaneous mechanism with our new idea stated above, that is, baryon and/or lepton asymmetries generated thermodynamically instead of through condensation. Further implications and details of our ideas will be discussed in the future publication [11].

Now let us go into some details of our scenario. First, we show that if a flat direction with neither baryon nor lepton number is charged under another global symmetry and has a nonzero expectation value, its phase (more precisely, the Nambu-Goldstone (NG) boson associated with breaking of the global symmetry) derivatively couples to the corresponding current. One of the famous examples of such a global symmetry is the PQ symmetry, which is introduced to solve the strong CP problem of quantum chromodynamics [12]. For definiteness, we adopt the supersymmetric DFSZ axion model² [13, 14], but it is trivial to extend it to the case with general global $U(1)$ symmetries.

Though a flat direction is specified by a holomorphic gauge-invariant polynomial, it is often described by a single complex scalar field $\Phi \equiv \phi/\sqrt{2} e^{i\theta}$. Assuming that a flat direction has only PQ charge, its phase is given by

$$\theta = \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{R} \alpha_R, \quad (5)$$

where N is the number of constituent fields, $\mathcal{R} \equiv \sum_i R_i$ is the sum of the PQ charges, R_i is the PQ charge of each field, and α_R is the angle conjugate to the generator of the PQ symmetry. If the flat direction has a nonzero expectation value, the PQ symmetry is spontaneously broken and a NG boson a_R appears, which is given by

$$a_R \equiv v_a \alpha_R, \quad (6)$$

where $v_a \sim \langle \phi \rangle$ is a decay constant. Then, the NG mode a_R transforms as $a_R \rightarrow a_R + v_a \epsilon$ under the PQ transformation $\alpha_R \rightarrow \alpha_R + \epsilon$.

In order to obtain the interaction between the NG mode a_R and the other charged fields, we define the PQ current as

$$J_R^\mu \equiv - \sum_{m'} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \chi_{m'})} \delta \chi_{m'}, \quad (7)$$

where m' denotes all fields with non-zero PQ charges; that is, $\chi_{m'}$ transforms under PQ symmetry as $\chi_{m'} \rightarrow \chi_{m'} + \epsilon \delta \chi_{m'}$ with $\delta \chi_{m'} = i R_{m'} \chi_{m'}$. Then, the PQ current is given by

$$J_R^\mu = v_a \partial^\mu a_R + \sum_m R_m j_m^\mu, \quad (8)$$

¹ In fact, baryogenesis is still possible for an interaction which violates both $U(1)_Q$ and lepton symmetries. In this case, a lepton asymmetry is generated, which can be converted into a baryon asymmetry through sphaleron effects. As a concrete example, we discuss this possibility later in detail.

² Here we assume that the PQ scalar fields, which are responsible for the spontaneous PQ symmetry breaking in the present universe, have negative mass squared of order of the Hubble parameter squared during inflation. Then we can avoid the problem of axion domain walls. In addition, cold dark matter (CDM) can also be explained by the axion in our scenario as a by-product of adopting the PQ symmetry.

where m denotes all fields with non-zero PQ charges except the NG mode a_R . Current conservation yields the equation of motion for a_R :

$$\partial_\mu J_{PQ}^\mu = v_a \partial^2 a_R + \sum_m R_m \partial_\mu j_m^\mu = 0. \quad (9)$$

Here the first term in the middle equation is the kinetic term for the NG mode a_R and the second term can be derived from the following effective Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = - \sum_m \frac{R_m}{v_a} (\partial_\mu a_R) j_m^\mu, \quad (10)$$

which yields the derivative interactions between the NG mode a_R and the other charged fields.

Next, we show that a flat direction has a nonzero expectation value during and after inflation, and the corresponding NG boson rolls down along the potential; that is, it acquires a nonzero velocity. Although there are no classical potentials along flat directions in the supersymmetric limit, they are lifted by both supersymmetry breaking effects and non-renormalizable operators. Adopting gravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking, a flat direction has a soft mass $m_\phi \sim 1\text{TeV}$. Moreover, assuming a non-renormalizable operator in the superpotential of the form

$$W = \frac{1}{nM^{n-3}} \Phi^n, \quad (11)$$

the flat direction is further lifted by the potential

$$V_{NR} = \frac{|\Phi|^{2n-2}}{M^{2n-6}}, \quad (12)$$

where M is a cutoff scale. During the inflationary epoch, there is another contribution to the potential. A flat direction has a negative mass squared proportional to the Hubble parameter squared, which is derived from a four-point coupling to the inflaton in the Kähler potential. Then, this negative mass squared term destabilizes the flat direction at the origin and the flat direction rolls down toward the minimum of the potential. The minimum of the potential ϕ_{min} is determined by the balance between the negative mass squared term and the non-renormalizable potential V_{NR} , and is given by

$$\phi_{\text{min}} \sim (HM^{n-3})^{\frac{1}{n-2}}. \quad (13)$$

In fact, the above non-renormalizable superpotential not only lifts the potential but also gives the charge-violating A-terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_A &= a_m \frac{m_{3/2}}{nM^{n-3}} \Phi^n + \text{h.c.} \\ &= M_A^4 \cos[k\mathcal{R}a_R/v_a], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $m_{3/2}$ is the gravitino mass, a_m is a complex constant of order unity, M_A is the energy scale of the A-term,

$k \equiv n/N$, and we have assumed a vanishing cosmological constant. By virtue of this A-term, the NG boson a_R begins rotating and acquires a nonzero velocity given by

$$|\dot{a}_R| \sim \frac{k\mathcal{R}}{Hv_a} M_A^4, \quad (15)$$

where we used the slow-roll approximation because the inverse curvature scale of the potential is roughly $\sqrt{m_{3/2}H} \ll H$. We have also assumed that a_R sits far from the extremum of the potential by $O(v_a)$.

The final ingredient to realize the spontaneous mechanism is an interaction which actually breaks the relevant symmetry. In this Letter, as stated in the introduction, we consider an interaction which violates multiple symmetries simultaneously, that is, PQ and lepton symmetries. Such a violating interaction is characterized by the amounts of violation of the PQ and lepton symmetries, that is, Δ_R and Δ_L . Then, since the produced asymmetries n_R and n_L should be proportional to the amount of each violation, the simple relation $n_R \Delta_L = n_L \Delta_R$ must be satisfied, or equivalently,

$$\sum_m \Xi_m n_m = 0, \quad (16)$$

where we have defined $\Xi_m = R_m \Delta_L - L_m \Delta_R$ and L_m is the lepton charge of the m -th field. However, generally speaking, the above relation is not satisfied by the usual estimate of the produced asymmetry given by

$$\bar{n}_m(t_D) = \frac{\kappa_m g_m}{6} \bar{\mu}_m T_D^2 \quad (17)$$

with $\bar{\mu}_m \equiv -R_m \dot{a}_R / v_a$. Therefore, $\bar{\mu}_m$ cannot be interpreted to be a chemical potential of the m -th field. Instead, we consider the projection of $\{\bar{\mu}_m\}$ onto the parameter plane perpendicular to $\{\Xi_m\}$ in order to satisfy the above constraint. Such a projection $\tilde{\mu}_m$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mu}_m \equiv \bar{\mu}_m - \frac{(\bar{\mu} \cdot \Xi)}{\Xi^2} \Xi_m, \quad (18)$$

where we adopt the general shorthand

$$\begin{aligned} Y^2 &\equiv \sum_m \kappa_m g_m Y_m^2, \\ Y \cdot Z &\equiv \sum_m \kappa_m g_m Y_m Z_m. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Then, it is easy to show that the $\tilde{\mu}_m$ are invariant under the transformation $\bar{\mu}_m \rightarrow \bar{\mu}_m + \alpha \Xi_m$ for an arbitrary constant α . By use of $\tilde{\mu}_m$, $\{n_m\}$ is given by

$$n_m(t_D) = \frac{\kappa_m g_m}{6} \tilde{\mu}_m T_D^2. \quad (20)$$

Then, the resultant lepton number density at decoupling

is given by³

$$n_L(t_D) = \sum_m L_m n_m = -\Delta_R \Delta_L \frac{C}{D} \frac{T_D^2}{6} \frac{\dot{a}_R}{v_a}, \quad (21)$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} C &= R^2 L^2 - (R \cdot L)^2, \\ D &= \Delta_L^2 R^2 + \Delta_R^2 L^2 - 2\Delta_L \Delta_R (R \cdot L). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

From this result, we can easily reconfirm that an interaction which has $\Delta_R \neq 0$ and $\Delta_L \neq 0$, that is, which violates both PQ and lepton symmetries simultaneously, is indispensable for the final generation of a lepton asymmetry.

As a concrete example of such a violating interaction, we consider the following dimension five operator,

$$\mathcal{L}_\Psi = \frac{2}{v} l l H_u H_u + \text{h.c.}, \quad (23)$$

where v is a scale characterizing the interaction and may be identified with the heavy Majorana mass for the right-handed neutrino in the context of the see-saw mechanism. Note that the above interaction breaks both PQ and lepton symmetries by $\Delta_R = 2(R_l + R_{H_u}) \neq 0$ and $\Delta_L = 2$. The violating rate of this interaction is given by $\Gamma \sim 0.04 T^3/v^2$ [16]. Then, the decoupling temperature is calculated as

$$T_D \sim 5 \times 10^{11} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{g_*}{200} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{v}{10^{14} \text{ GeV}} \right)^2, \quad (24)$$

where g_* counts the effective degrees of freedom for relativistic particles.

A part of the produced lepton asymmetry is converted into baryon asymmetry through sphaleron effects [17], which is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n_B}{s} &= \frac{120k\mathcal{R}(R_L + R_{H_u})}{23\pi^2 g_*} \frac{C}{D} \frac{m_{3/2}}{T_D} \\ &\sim 3 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{3 \text{ TeV}} \right) \left(\frac{T_D}{10^{12} \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we have assumed that $\dot{a}_R > 0$ and that PQ charges are of order unity.

Finally we discuss the constraint on the reheating temperature due to the gravitino problem. For $m_{3/2} = 3 \sim 10$ TeV, the reheating temperature is constrained as $T_{RH} \lesssim 10^{12}$ GeV, assuming that the mass of the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is $O(100 \text{ GeV})$ [18].

If we take this bound seriously, the decoupling temperature T_D must be less than 10^{12} GeV so that the violating interaction is in thermal equilibrium. For $m_{3/2} \sim 100$ GeV, the reheating temperature must be smaller than $T_{RH} \lesssim 10^9$ GeV. However, these constraints on the reheating temperature are evaded by the introduction of a supersymmetric partner with a mass much lighter than 100 GeV. One such particle is the axino, which naturally exists in our scenario. In fact, it was shown that the reheating temperature is constrained rather loosely as $T_{RH} < 10^{15}$ GeV for $m_{3/2} \simeq 100$ GeV, if the axino is the LSP and the gravitino is the next-to-lightest supersymmetric particle (NLSP) [19].

In summary, we have discussed a spontaneous baryogenesis mechanism with an interaction violating another global symmetry in addition to baryon (lepton) symmetry. We have shown that even if a scalar field derivatively couples not to baryon current but to another current associated with some global symmetry $U(1)_Q$, baryogenesis is still possible by virtue of such a violating interaction. As a concrete realization of our idea, we have discussed baryogenesis in the context of a flat direction with neither baryon nor lepton charge. First, we have shown that the phase of such a flat direction, strictly speaking, the NG boson associated with breaking of the symmetry, derivatively couples to the global current if it is charged under another global $U(1)_Q$ symmetry, such as the PQ symmetry. The A-term gives this NG boson a nonzero velocity, which leads to the CPT violation. By virtue of the interaction violating $U(1)_Q$ and baryon (lepton) symmetries simultaneously, CPT violation is transmitted to the baryon (lepton) sector, which makes it possible to generate baryon (lepton) asymmetry for this flat direction. In the case of a lepton asymmetry production, a part of the lepton asymmetry is converted into the baryon asymmetry through sphaleron effects.

We are grateful to W. Kelly for useful comments and correcting the English. F.T. is grateful to S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki for useful discussions. We are partially supported by the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, and M.Y. is partially supported by Department of Energy under Grant # DEFG0291ER40688.

³ More precisely, this result applies only for a flat direction which does not include squarks, such as LH_{de} [15]. The result for a flat direction which includes squarks will be given in publication [11]. But, while the forms of C and D become more complicated, the essential result does not change.

-
- [1] A. D. Sakharov, Pis'ma Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **5**, 32 (1967) [JETP. Lett. **5**, 24 (1967)].
 - [2] A. G. Cohen and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B **199**, 251 (1987).
 - [3] A. Dolgov and K. Freese, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 2693 (1995); A. Dolgov, K. Freese, R. Ranagarajan, and M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6155 (1997).
 - [4] M. Z. Li, X. L. Wang, B. Feng, and X. M. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 103511 (2002); M. Li and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **573**, 20 (2003).
 - [5] A. De Felice, S. Nasri, and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. D

- 67**, 043509 (2003).
- [6] M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 063507 (2003); R. H. Brandenberger and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 023505 (2003).
 - [7] I. Affleck and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. **B249**, 361 (1985).
 - [8] A. Kusenko and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 46 (1998).
 - [9] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Nucl. Phys. **B538**, 321 (1999).
 - [10] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 041301 (2000).
 - [11] F. Takahashi and M. Yamaguchi, hep-ph/0308173.
 - [12] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977).
 - [13] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. B **104**, 199 (1981); A. R. Zhitnitsky, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 260 (1980).
 - [14] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **514**, 330 (2001).
 - [15] T. Gherghetta, C. Kolda, and S. P. Martin, Nucl. Phys. **B468**, 37 (1996).
 - [16] U. Sarkar, hep-ph/9809209; W. Buchmuller, hep-ph/0101102.
 - [17] S. Yu. Khlebnikov and M. F. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **B308**, 885 (1988); J. A. Harvey and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3344 (1990).
 - [18] M. Yu. Khlopov and A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **138B**, 265 (1984); J. Ellis, E. Kim, and D. V. Nanopoulos, *ibid*, **145B**, 181(1984); M. Kawasaki and T. Moroi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **93**, 879 (1995); E. Holtmann, M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, and T. Moroi, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 023506 (1999).
 - [19] T. Asaka and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **494**, 297 (2000).